REMARKS

Claims 1-53 were rejected under 35 USC 103 based on Nakashima et al, Giorgio et al and Erickson et al. Applicants have canceled claims 1-53 and submitted new claims 54-87. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection as applied to the new claims based on the following:

New claim 54 recites a method for communicating to a host system a change in status of a subsystem coupled to the host system. The subsystem receives a request by the host system to monitor a status of the subsystem and report a change in the status when a minimum numerical amount of the change occurs, but not report a change when no change occurs or less than the minimum numerical amount of change occurs. The request specifies the minimum numerical amount of the change. In response to the receiving step, the subsystem monitors status of the subsystem. If the minimum numerical amount of the change subsequently occurs in the status, the subsystem reports the change to the host system, but does not report a change when no change occurs or less than said minimum numerical amount of change occurs.

Thus, new claim 54 recites that a change in status is reported when a minimum numerical amount of change in the status occurs, and that the host system specifies this minimum numerical amount. Nakashima et al. disclose polling and asynchronous reporting of status information messages, i.e. traps. However, Nakashima et al. do not disclose or suggest that a change in status is not reported until a numerical minimum change in status has occurred. Nakashima et al. also do not disclose that the numerical minimum is specified by the host computer. Therefore, two features of new claim 54 are not taught by Nakashima et al. Neither feature would have been obvious in view of Nakashima et al. because Nakashima et al. are concerned with the occurrence of **events** such as the occurrence of faults or configuration changes:

"This status message T, serving as a "trap" defined in the SNMP specification, delivers event information such as faults or configuration changes occurred in the monitored controllers." Column 4 lines 44-46.

These types of events are not quantified; they either occur or do not occur. So, there are no numerical minimums to specify, no need for the host computer to specify them, and no suggestion in Nakashima et al. to consider numerical minimums. Therefore, new claim 54 was not obvious in view of Nakashima et al.

Giorgio et al. also disclose the reporting of **events** such as reset, power on, power off or removal of a storage media from a controller:

"SCSI is an intelligent protocol whereby bus sequences and target/initiator conditions are monitored. There are a number of conditions designated as UNIT ATTENTION. It will be described using target 24a although it is to be understood it is the same for all targets 24a-g. These UNIT ATTENTION conditions exist when the controller 10 or an SCSI target 24a is reset, power to a target controller 10 is cycled from OFF to ON or from ON to OFF, or media has been removed and replaced within the internal controller of target 24a." Column 4 lines 58-67.

So, in Giorgio et al., there are no numerical minimums to specify, no need for the host computer to specify them, and therefore no suggestion to consider numerical minimums. Therefore, new claim 54 was not obvious in view of Giorgio et al. Moreover, because these two features of new claim 54 are absent from both Nakashima et al. and Giorgio et al. and no suggestion in either Nakashima et al. or Giorgio et al for these features, these features would not have been obvious in view of the combination of Nakashima et al. and Giorgio et al.

Erickson et al. disclose the SAF-TE enclosure and protocol, including the polling technique inherent to the traditional SAF-TE. But, Erickson et al. do not teach the foregoing two features of new claim 54 and the Examiner did not assert Erickson et al. against these two features.

Based on the foregoing, new claim 54 and its dependent claims 55-61 should be allowable. New independent claim 62 distinguishes over the prior art for the same reasons that new claim 54 distinguishes there over. Therefore, new claim 62 and its dependent claims 63-69 should be allowable also.

New claim 70 recites a computer system comprising a host system and a subsystem coupled to the host system. The subsystem receives a request by the host system to monitor a status of the subsystem and report a change in the status when the change occurs or in absence of the change during a predetermined period following the request, report no change in the status, but not reporting lack of change of the status before the predetermined period lapses. In response to the receiving step, the subsystem monitors status of the subsystem. If a change occurs in the status before the predetermined period lapses, the subsystem reports the change in status to the host system, wherein before the change occurs, the subsystem not reporting the status of the subsystem to the host system. If a change does not occur in the status before the predetermined period lapses, the subsystem reports no change in the status upon lapse of the predetermined period.

Thus, new claim 70 recites that the subsystem receives a request by the host system to monitor a status of the subsystem and report a change in the status when the change occurs or in absence of the change during a predetermined period following the request, report no change in status, but not reporting lack of change of the status before the predetermined period lapse. None of the cited art teaches this feature of new claim 70. Nakashima et al. teach SNMP traps, as noted above. The traps of Nakashima et al. are not generated in the absence of an event. Moreover, the traps of Nakashima et al. are not generated during a predetermined period from when the request is made. Likewise, Giorgio et al. disclose traps with the same limitations as those of Nakashima et al. Erickson et al. are limited to the polling technique inherent to the traditional SAF-TE. Therefore, none of the references teaches the foregoing feature of new claim

70. This feature would not have been obvious in view of Nakashima et al. and Giorgio et al. because there is no suggestion of this feature. It is inconsistent with the traditional concept of a "trap" to generate it when nothing happens. This feature of new claim 70 would not have been obvious in view of Erickson et al. because Erickson is limited to the polling technique inherent to the traditional SAF-TE. Therefore, new claim 70 should be allowable.

Claims 71-78 depend on new claim 70 and therefore should be allowable as well.

Dependent claim 78 recites that the host computer specifies the predetermined period in the request. This further distinguishes over the cited art. This feature would not have been obvious in view of the prior art because the prior art does not consider a predetermined period after a request is made to report back, even when no change has occurred.

New independent claim 79 and dependent claims 80-87 distinguish over the prior art for the same reasons that claims 70-78 distinguish thereover. Dependent claim 87 adds a similar, additional limitation as dependent claim 78.

Based on the foregoing, the present patent application as amended above should be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,

Arthur Samodovitz
Reg. No. 31,297